

**Appl. No.** : 10/820,415  
**Filed** : April 8, 2004

### **REMARKS**

With this amendment, Claims 1-7 are pending in the above-captioned application. Claim 1 has been amended. In view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of this application.

#### Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-2 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Tran et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,473,337). After carefully reviewing the Tran reference, Applicant notes that Tran does not disclose an antifusing device comprising a first and second layers of magnetic material forming an MTJ and a first circuit that is selectable so as to interconnect the first layer to a first potential *such that the first and second layers are shorted together to affect the logical outcome of a logic circuit of an electrical device in a manner so as to achieve a desired circuit configuration of the electrical device.* (See, e.g., Claim 1 as amended)

While Tran discloses the possibility of using an MTJ as an antifusing device, Tran is directed to a memory device with dual tunnel junction memory cells having an MTJ in series with a tunnel junction. Example 1 of Tran discloses applying a write voltage to blow the MTJ antifuse, but does not teach or suggest selectably shorting the MTJ in order to affect the logical outcome of a logic circuit of an electrical device to achieve a desired circuit configuration. In fact, Tran does not appear to teach or suggest selectively shorting an MTJ antifuse to affect the functionality of an electrical device. Since Tran does not disclose each and every element claimed in the pending independent Claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1 is patentable over Tran.

#### Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 3 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Tran reference. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 3 and 5 are patentable over Tran because of their dependence from Claim 1.

The Examiner also rejected Claims 6-7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Tran reference in view of Scheler et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,630,703). Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 6-7 are also patentable over Tran in view of Scheler because of their dependence from Claim 1.

Appl. No. : 10/820,415  
Filed : April 8, 2004


**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims of the present application are in condition for allowance, and such action is earnestly solicited. Should there be any impediment to the prompt allowance of this application that could be resolved through a telephone conference, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned at the number shown below. Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: 12/28/2004

By:   
Linda H. Liu  
Registration No. 51,240  
Attorney of Record  
Customer No. 20,995  
(951) 781-9231

R:\DOCS\HL\HL-8445.DOC  
122704